

On Order-independent Semantics of the Similarity Group-By Relational Database Operator

Mingjie Tang¹ Ruby Y. Tahboub¹ Walid G. Aref¹ Qutaibah M. Malluhi² Mourad Ouzzani³
¹Purdue University ²Qatar University ³Qatar Computing Research Institute
 {tang49,rtahboub,aref}@cs.purdue.edu, qmalluhi@qu.edu.qa, mouzzani@qf.org.qa

ABSTRACT

Similarity group-by (SGB, for short) has been proposed as a relational database operator to match the needs of emerging database applications. Many SGB operators that extend SQL have been proposed in the literature, e.g., similarity operators in the one-dimensional space. These operators have various semantics. Depending on how these operators are implemented, some of the implementations may lead to different groupings of the data. Hence, if SQL code is ported from one database system to another, it is not guaranteed that the code will produce the same results. In this paper, we investigate the various semantics for the relational similarity group-by operators in the multi-dimensional space. We define the class of order-independent SGB operators that produce the same results regardless of the order in which the input data is presented to them. Using the notion of interval graphs borrowed from graph theory, we prove that, for certain SGB operators, there exist order-independent implementations. For each of these operators, we provide a sample algorithm that is order-independent. Also, we prove that for other SGB operators, there does not exist an order-independent implementation for them, and hence these SGB operators are ill-defined and should not be adopted in extensions to SQL to realize similarity group-by. In this paper, we introduce an SGB operator, namely SGB-All, for grouping multi-dimensional data using similarity. SGB-All forms groups such that a data item, say O , belongs to a group, say G , if and only if O is within a user-defined threshold from all other data items in G . In other words, each group in SGB-All forms a clique of nearby data items in the multi-dimensional space. One case that arises in both SGB operators is when a data item qualifies the membership condition of multiple groups. For example, in the case of SGB-All, a data item, say O , can form a clique with two groups, say G_1 and G_2 . We propose three semantics for handling data items that overlap multiple groups, namely, Eliminate, Duplicate, and New-Group. We prove that all three options are order-independent, i.e., there is at least one algorithm for each option that is independent of the presentation order of the input data.

1. INTRODUCTION

Forming groups of data items to support decision making is a fundamental function of a database management system. Traditionally, grouping is performed by aggregating the tuples with equal values on a certain subset of attributes into the same groups. However, in some application domains, e.g., business intelligence, sensor networks, and location-

based queries, users are often interested in grouping based on similar rather than strictly equal values.

Clustering is one way of grouping similar and closeby data items together. Clustering is a well-known operation in data mining and machine learning with well-established tools, e.g., Weka [1]. In most cases, clustering is performed outside the database system, which leads to several issues: First, it creates a costly impedance mismatch that results from having to extract the data outside of the database to perform the clustering. Moreover, based on the needs of the underlying applications, the output clusters may need to be further processed by SQL to filter out some of the clusters and perform further SQL operations on the remaining ones. Hence, it is of great benefit to develop a practical and fast similarity group-by operator that can be embedded within a SQL query and that is compatible with other SQL operators. This would allow answering complex similarity-based queries efficiently.

Silva et al. [2, 3] introduce the similarity group-by operator (SGB) in a variety of flavors that can be used in an SQL query in combination with other relational operators and that can take advantage of database query optimization techniques, e.g., pushing joins under similarity-group-by. However, the problem with the SGB operators in [2, 3] is two-fold. First, these SGB operators are one-dimensional, i.e., they group the data of each attribute independently from the other attributes. Hence, they cannot detect correlations among the various attributes. Secondly, the semantics of these SGB operators such that these operators are order-dependent, i.e., the outcome of these SGB operators may differ depending on the order in which the input tuples are processed. Therefore, if SQL code is ported from one database system to another, there is no guarantee that it will produce the same results.

In this paper, we investigate the semantics of various multi-attribute similarity group-by operators. We define the class of multi-dimensional order-independent SGB operators that will produce the same results regardless of the order in which the input tuples are being processed. We demonstrate that, for several of these SGB operators, there exist order-independent implementations for them.

In contrast to relational group-by where a tuple may belong to one and only one group, in similarity group-by, a tuple may belong to multiple groups if that tuple is in the proximity of these groups. We provide several similarity group-by semantics to handle these overlapping tuples and prove that the algorithms realizing these semantics are order-independent.




Figure 1: Unsupervised Similarity Group-by SGB-U

The contributions of this paper can be summarized as follows.

1. We introduce the notion of order-independent similarity group-by operators (SGB) and provide several definitions of SGB operators that are order-independent. We give proofs that several of these SGB operators are actually order-independent. In contrast, for other SGB operators that are not order-independent, we give counter-examples that illustrate their order-dependence.
2. We study the cases when a tuple overlaps more than one group. We provide several semantics to handle overlapping tuples and prove that these semantics are order-independent.
3. We provide sample order-independent algorithms for the introduced SGB operators to minimize the running time complexity via group bound, then analyze the proposed algorithm's complexity and order independent properties.

The rest of this paper proceeds as follows. Section 2 motivates the need for order-independent SGB operators. Section 3 presents and discusses related work. Section 4 provides relevant background material. Section 5 presents existing and new SGB operators and investigates their order-independence. Section 7 gives efficient algorithms to implement the SGB operators along with analyses of their complexities. Section 8 presents the proofs of correctness for order-independence for the new SGB operators based on the proposed group bound approach using the notion of interval graphs. Finally, Section 9 contains concluding remarks.

2. MOTIVATION

To illustrate the need for order-independent similarity group-by operators, consider the unsupervised similarity group-by operator (SGB-U), introduced in [2]. SGB-U is a one-dimensional SGB operator that takes as input one attribute/column of the input table and extends SQL's standard Group-by with two similarity predicates: (i) The *maximum_element_separation* (or *separation*) defines the maximum distance between two adjacent elements in a group. It controls the compactness or closeness among elements within the same group. (ii) The

maximum_group_diameter (or *diameter*) is the distance between the two farthest elements within a group. For example, in the linear space, a group with elements {1, 5, 6} has a *separation* of 4 and a *diameter* of 5.

Consider the query example illustrated in Figure 1a that uses SGB-U. Given the relation *customer*, the query finds the maximum expense of groups of customers with similar expense values. Similarity in this query is defined by a separation value of 2 and a diameter value of 6. Suppose the values of the *expense* attribute in Table *Customer* are processed in the following order: {1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 10}. In this case, elements {1, 3, 5, 7} and elements {9, 10} form two distinct groups, Group 1 and Group 2, respectively. For Group 1, the separation between adjacent elements is within threshold 2 and the diameter of the group is 6. Similarly, for Group 2, both the separation and diameter are equal to 1, as illustrated in Figure 1b. Now, assume that SGB-U is presented with the input tuples in a different order, e.g., in the order {10, 1, 9, 3, 7, 5} (refer to Figure 1c). In this case, two totally different groups are formed, namely Group 1' with elements {1, 3} and Group 2' with elements {7, 9, 10}. In addition, when processing the tuple with value 5, it can be inserted into both groups since 5 is within 2 units from the tuple with value 3 in Group 1 and the tuple with value 7 in Group 2. Therefore, the outcome of SGB-U is order-dependent and overlapping data elements do not have a clear semantics. As a result, given two implementations of SGB-U in two database systems, it is possible that the same SQL code when operating on the same input database will produce completely different results. The target of this paper is to identify multi-dimensional order-independent SGB operators that would produce the same result regardless of the presentation order of the input tables.

3. RELATED WORK

In this section, we review the related work in three main areas: clustering, existing similarity-based grouping operators in relational database systems, and graph theory.

Clustering (also referred to as unsupervised learning) is a well-studied problem in data mining. Clustering forms groups of similar data items for the purpose of learning hidden knowledge about the data. Clustering algorithms have been studied extensively, e.g., see [4, 5]. Among the widely used clustering algorithms are the K-means [6], disk-optimized algorithms, e.g., BIRCH [7], and DBSCAN [8]. The key difference between SGB operators and clustering are: (1) SGB is a relational database operator that is integrated within relational query evaluation pipelines with various grouping semantics. Hence, it avoids the impedance mismatch experienced by standalone clustering packages that mandate extracting the data to be clustered out of the dbms. (2) In contrast to standalone clustering algorithms, SGB can be interleaved with other relational operators, e.g., joins and selects, (3) standard relational query optimizations that apply to group-by are also applicable to SGB, as illustrated in [2, 3]. This is not feasible with standalone clustering algorithms. Also, improved performance can be gained by using database access methods that process multi-dimensional data.

The work in [9] introduces proximity semantics to overcome the limitation of distinct-value group-by operators. Their proposed SQL construct, termed "ClusterBy", uses conventional clustering algorithms, e.g., DBSCAN to real-

ize similarity grouping. ClusterBy addresses the impedance mismatch issue but does not address the order-independence issue that we address in this paper.

Previous work on similarity-based grouping [2, 3] introduce generic semantics for three core database SGB operators. The unsupervised similarity group-by operator, SGB-U, realizes groups by applying two similarity predicates that evaluate the compactness and diameter of a group. The SGB-Around operator is a classifier operator where it uses predefined guiding points (referred to as center points) to form groups around these centers. The SGB-Delimited operator uses a set of delimiting points to segment the input tuples into groups. In addition to being one-dimensional and not handling correlated multi-attributes, these three operators overlook the order in which the input tuples are processed and its effect on the operator's outcome. This paper builds on [2, 3] with a focus on order-independent SGB semantics for multi-dimensional data.

The SGB order-independence proofs given in this paper build on previous work on graph theory including interval graphs [10] and maximal cliques [11]. A clique is a connected subgraph, where each vertex has an edge to every other vertex in the clique subgraph. The maximal clique problem finds the maximum size clique within a graph and is an extensively studied problem [11]. For multi-dimensional data, when allowing data tuples to belong to multiple groups, e.g., as in the case of tuples that overlap multiple groups, listing maximal cliques sets becomes exponential. A large body of work addresses approximate solutions for the maximal clique problem (e.g., see [12]). [13] approximates the clique problem for disk-based data sets by finding all three-vertex cliques (i.e., triangles) in the graph. A fundamental difference between graph search problems and the proposed SGB operators in this paper is that we do not build any graph beforehand. Instead, the edges between the tuples are implicit and are formed dynamically based on the similarity between the tuples (i.e., the vertexes), and the SGB operators incrementally process the input and form the output groups.

4. BACKGROUND MATERIAL

In this section, we provide background material and formally introduce the class of order-independent similarity group-by operators.

Definition 1. A **similarity measure** is defined by a distance function δ that uses the Minkowski distance L_p [14].

In this paper, we consider the following two Minkowski distances, where t_x is a tuple and t_{xy} is its y^{th} attribute:

- The Euclidean Distance:

$$L_2 : \delta_2(t_i, t_j) = \sqrt{\sum_{i'} (t_{ii'} - t_{ji'})^2}$$
- The Maximum infinity distance:

$$L_\infty : \delta_\infty(t_i, t_j) = \max_{i'} |t_{ii'} - t_{ji'}|.$$

Definition 2. A **similarity predicate** $\xi(\delta, \epsilon)$ is a Boolean expression that uses the distance function δ and the threshold ϵ , and returns TRUE iff the distance between its two input tuples t_i and t_j is less than ϵ , i.e.,

$$\xi_{\delta, \epsilon}(t_i, t_j) : \delta(t_i, t_j) \leq \epsilon.$$

In this case, the two tuples t_i and t_j are said to be similar.




Figure 2: Supervised Similarity Group-by Around SGB-A

Definition 3. Let T be a relation that consists of a tuple set $\{t_1, \dots, t_m\}$. Each tuple $t_i \in T$ is defined as $\{t_{i.GA_1}, \dots, t_{i.GA_d}, t_{i.NGA_1}, \dots, t_{i.NGA_k}\}$, where the subset $GA_c = \{t_{i.GA_1} \dots t_{i.GA_d}\}$ represents a multi-dimensional grouping attribute, and the subset $NGA = \{t_{i.NGA_1} \dots t_{i.NGA_k}\}$ represents the non-grouping attributes. Let $\xi_{\delta, \epsilon}$ be similarity predicates. A **similarity Group-by operator** $\mathcal{G}_{(GA_c, (\xi_{\delta, \epsilon}))}(T)$ forms a set of answer groups G_s by applying the similarity predicates $\xi_{\delta, \epsilon}$ on the elements of the multi-dimensional grouping attribute GA_c . That is, a pair of tuples, say t_x and t_y , are in the same group iff: $\xi_{\delta, \epsilon}(t_x.GA_c, t_y.GA_c) = TRUE$.

We study the effect of the order of presenting the input tuples of T to the similarity group-by operator on the outcome of the operator. In particular, we define the necessary conditions that guarantee that the operators' output groups $G_s = \{G_1, \dots, G_m\}$ are independent of any order of the input tuples. Based on these conditions, we then introduce and study new order-independent SGB operators.

5. SIMILARITY GROUP-BY OPERATORS

In the section, we study the semantics of existing SGB operators as defined in [2] and formally prove whether or not they belong to the class of order-independent SGB operators. Then, we introduce several new SGB operators and prove their order-independence and analyze their complexity.

5.1 Unsupervised SGB (SGB-U)

As illustrated by the example given in Section 2, SGB-U is order-dependent based on the counter-example given, and hence the following lemma is true.

Lemma 1. The SGB-U operator is order-dependent.

Using the construction in Figure 1, permuting the order of input may produce different groupings. The maximum diameter predicate determines the start- and end-points of a group. Hence, changing the order of processing input may cause the start- and end-points of another group to shift resulting in a different grouping.

5.2 SGB Around (SGB-A)

Another interesting SGB operator is the similarity group-by Around, or SGB-A for short [2]. SGB-A extends the SGB-U operator with a set of guiding points (termed central points), where groups are composed around these points. Tuples of the input table are assigned to the closest center point. The optional *maximum_element_separation* predicate determines the maximum allowable distance between two

adjacent tuples in a group. The optional diameter predicate in SGB-A determines the group bounds, where the diameter is centered at the guiding point (i.e., at position $d/2$).

Consider the query example illustrated in Figure 2a. Given the relation *customer*, the example query finds the maximum expense of groups formed around center points 4 and 10. The separation is set to the value 2 and the maximum allowable diameter is set to the value 6. Suppose that the input is processed in the following order $\{1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11\}$. In this case, Group 1 consists of $\{1, 3, 5\}$ while Group 2 consists of $\{9, 11\}$. The tuple with value 7 is within equal distance from both center points. Hence, 7 can join either group. The semantics of SGB-A is ambiguous in the sense that it does not provide arbitration semantics to resolve the case of overlapping tuples, i.e., ones that can belong to more than one group, and hence the following lemma is true.

Lemma 2. The semantics of the SGB-A operator is ambiguous.

In general, using a counter-example construction similar to the one in Figure 2, there may exist a tuple e_i that is within equal distance from center points c_1 and c_2 , and $c_1 \neq c_2$.

5.3 Order-independent SGB Operators

In this section, we introduce several order-independent SGB operators, namely the family of the SGB-All operators.

Definition 4. Given a table $T = \{t_1, \dots, t_m\}$, where t_i is a multi-dimensional tuple and T' is a permutation of Table T . Let GA be a multi-dimensional grouping attribute. The outcome of the **order-independent Similarity Group-by** operator $\tilde{G}$ is independent of the order of the input tuples iff

$$\tilde{G}_{T_{GA}}(T) = \tilde{G}_{T'_{GA}}(T')$$

5.3.1 Group Definition

In this section, we use distance as a measure to develop the notion of similarity among data elements that constitute a single group. Refer to Figure 3 for illustration. In Figure 3a, the distance between all pairs of data elements satisfies the predefined similarity threshold $\epsilon = 3$. The notable characteristic of this grouping is that elements are dense and form a clique-like group.

Definition 5. Group Compactness (Gpact). Group Compactness (or Gpact, for short) is the number of tuple pairs $\langle t_i, t_j \rangle$ inside a group, say G_m , where the similarity predicate $\xi_{\delta, \epsilon}(t_i, t_j)$ is true.

Definition 6. Given a set of tuples that form a group, say G_{all} . G_{all} is said to be **All- ϵ -Connected** if, for all pairs $t_i, t_j \in G_{all}$, the similarity predicate between t_i and t_j is true, i.e.,

$$\forall t_i, t_j \in G_{all}, \xi_{\delta, \epsilon}(t_i, t_j)$$

Proposition 1. Let G_{all} be an All- ϵ -Connected group that contains k tuples. Then,

$$Gpact(G_{all}) = k * (k - 1) / 2.$$




Figure 3: The notions of similarity within a group $\epsilon = 3$

5.3.2 Semantics of Order-independent SGB Operators

Given an input table, say T , of tuples, an SGB operator generates an output set of groups, say G_s . The various mappings between the tuples of T and the groups G_s determine the semantics of the various SGB operators.

SGB-All: SGB-All divides tuples in T into groups in G_s , such that each group in G_s is All- ϵ -Connected and is maximal. Notice that a Group G_m is maximal when no group G'_m exists such that $G_m \subset G'_m$ and G'_m is All- ϵ -Connected. Formally,

Refer to Figure 3(b) for illustration. In the figure, tuples are modeled as points in the 2D space. When $\epsilon = 3$, applying the SGB-All semantics on the input tuples produces the three groups: $G_1 = \{a_1, a_2, b_2, c_1\}$, $G_2 = \{b_1, a_2, b_2, c_1\}$ and $G_3 = \{c_1, c_2, a_2, b_2\}$.

Definition 7. Overlap Set OSet: A tuple is in the set *OSet* iff the tuple belongs to more than one group in $(G_1, \dots, G_s)$. Formally, $Oset = \cup_{(i,j) \in s} (G_i \cap G_j)$ where $s > 1$.

Referring to the input tuples in Figure 3(b), the overlap set *OSet* is comprised of $\{a_2, b_2, c_1\}$.

5.3.3 Similarity Group-by ALL (SGB-All)

The corresponding SQL syntax for the SGB-All operator is as follows:

```
SELECT column, aggregate-func(column)
FROM table-name
WHERE condition
GROUP BY column DISTANCE-TO-ALL [ $L_2$  |
LINF] WITHIN eps
ON-OVERLAP[ DUPLICATE | ELIMINATE |
NEW-GROUP]
```

SGB-All uses the following clauses to realize similarity-based grouping:

- The DISTANCE-TO-ALL similarity predicate specifies the metric space distance function to be applied when deciding group memberships.
 - L_2 : Euclidean distance
 - LINF: the Maximum infinity distance
- ON-OVERLAP is an arbitration clause to be used in the situation when a tuple is within eps distance from more than one group.




Figure 4: Similarity-based Grouping $\epsilon = 6$

The following are the possible arbitration actions of the ON-OVERLAP clause:

- **DUPLICATE**: inserts an input tuple, say t , into all the groups that t belongs to. Given an input table, say T , the ON-OVERLAP DUPLICATE option is interpreted as inserting all the tuples of $OSet$ into their corresponding overlapped groups from G_s . The ON-OVERLAP DUPLICATE option maps to the problem of listing maximal cliques in an undirected graph. Analysis of the ON-OVERLAP DUPLICATE option is presented in Section 7.
- **ELIMINATE**: discards the tuples that overlap multiple groups. Given an input table, say T , the ON-OVERLAP ELIMINATE option is interpreted as deleting all the tuples of $OSet$ from all overlapped groups.
- **NEW-GROUP**: inserts the overlapped data elements into a new group. Given an input table, say T , the ON-OVERLAP NEW-GROUP option is interpreted as creating new group sets for $OSet$ until $OSet$ is empty. Analysis of this option is presented in Section 7.

To illustrate, the following query example performs the aggregate operations *max*, *min* and *count* on the groups formed by SGB-All on attributes *Earnings* and *Expense* from relation *Customers* given in Figure 4.

```
SELECT min(earnings), max(expense), count(*)
FROM customer
GROUP BY earnings, expense DISTANCE-TO-ALL L2
WITHIN 6
```

Referring to the input table in Figure 4, the following groups satisfy the above SGB-All predicates: $G_1 = \{t_1, t_2, t_3\}$, $G_2 = \{t_4, t_5, t_6\}$ and $G_3 = \{t_7, t_8\}$. However, t_3 is also within ϵ from t_4 in G_2 . Consequently, an arbitration ON-OVERLAP clause is necessary. We consider the three possible semantics below for illustration.

If we have an ON-OVERLAP DUPLICATE clause, since t_3 is within ϵ from t_4 but is not within ϵ from t_5 or t_6 , t_3 cannot be added to G_2 . Similarly, t_4 cannot be added into G_1 since t_4 is not within ϵ from t_1 and t_2 in G_1 . Therefore, a new group is created, say $G_4 = \{t_3, t_4\}$ and is produced in addition to the three other groups. Therefore, the answer

to the query in the case of ON-OVERLAP DUPLICATE is: $\{\langle 3, 4, 3 \rangle, \langle 8, 9, 3 \rangle, \langle 18, 4, 2 \rangle, \langle 5, 7, 2 \rangle\}$.

If we have an ON-OVERLAP ELIMINATE clause, the overlapped tuples t_3 and t_4 get dropped. Therefore, the resulting groups are $G_1 = \{t_1, t_2\}$, $G_2 = \{t_5, t_6\}$ and $G_3 = \{t_7, t_8\}$ and the query output is $\{\langle 3, 3, 2 \rangle, \langle 10, 9, 2 \rangle, \langle 18, 4, 2 \rangle\}$.

If we have an ON-OVERLAP NEW-GROUP clause, the overlapped tuples are inserted into newly created group sets until overlap sets are empty. The result groups are $G_1 = \{t_1, t_2\}$, $G_2 = \{t_5, t_6\}$, $G_3 = \{t_7, t_8\}$ and $G_4 = \{t_3, t_4\}$, and the query output will be $\{\langle 3, 3, 2 \rangle, \langle 10, 9, 2 \rangle, \langle 18, 4, 2 \rangle, \langle 5, 7, 2 \rangle\}$. Notice that this output is un-ambiguous in the sense that it should be independent of the order in which the input tuples are processed.

6. APPLICATIONS AND GRAPH REPRESENTATION OF SGB

6.1 Applications

This section presents several application scenarios that demonstrate the practical use of the various SGB semantics.

Highly Correlated Stock Analysis: To analyze stocks over time, [15] converts the stock market datasets to a graph by mapping one stock into a vertex, then connecting two vertices iff their correlation coefficient is no smaller than a user-specified threshold. Stocks in the graph that form a clique are very meaningful from the application's point of view, as this implies that the prices of these stocks are contained in the same group that usually evolve synchronously over time, and a change of one stock price can be used to predict a similar change for the prices of all the other stocks in the same group. The proposed SGB-All semantics naturally construct these cliques, and each tuple in the same group stands the clique properties. Thus, people can analyze the highly correlated stock profiles using the SGB-All operator.

Geo-social network analysis: When users check-in or share photos in social networks, the server records the users' spatial locations, e.g., their latitude and longitude. This geo-spatial information may reflect common behavior of people in a group. It may also help in marketing. For example, people who happen to be watching a concert or a movie, or go for shopping and have similar geo-locations, these shoppers stand a higher possibility to share the same interest or preference with products. In this scenario, SGB-All queries can identify groups where people are highly correlated given their spatial locations. If one individual shows interest in a product, e.g., a certain brand of T-shirts, using SGB-All, In this case, the social network can recommend targetted advertisements of certain products to the people in the same group as they are likely to show similar interest.

6.2 Graph Representation of SGB

We use a graph to represent the semantics of each of the SGB operators. Refer to Figure 5a that gives tuples in the 2D space and their corresponding equivalent graph representation in Figure 5b. The relation is mapped into the equivalent graph as follows. Each input tuple is mapped to a vertex. An edge connects a pair of tuples, say t_i and t_j , whenever the similarity predicate $\xi_{\delta, \epsilon}(t_i, t_j)$ is true.

Referring to Figures 5c-e, the semantics of SGB-All Duplicate finds all maximal cliques in the graph. The SGB-




Figure 5: Graph representations of the various SGB semantics.

All Eliminate discards all overlapped tuples and finds the cliques that are not overlapped among more than one group. The cliques in SGB-All Eliminate case are not maximal because the overlapped tuples are dropped. The SGB-All New-Group forms new group(s) from overlapped tuples that translate to finding the overlapped cliques.

Notice that it is possible to extract the tuples and construct the corresponding graph outside of the database. Then, by using any graph-based processing tool, we can find and produce the cliques as output. However, for the reasons stated in the introduction section, mainly, to avoid the impedance mismatch of having to export data out of the database and then import the results back into the database for further processing, we want to perform this clique detection operation and the SGB-ALL operation within the database system. As we scan the input tuples using a table-scan operator, we want to partially construct the corresponding graph on the fly as well as detect the formed cliques. Notice that as we see more tuples, the existing cliques are likely to grow while new cliques will form or split from existing ones.

7. ORDER-INDEPENDENT ALGORITHM FOR THE SGB OPERATOR

In this section, we present an order-independent algorithm for the SGB-All operator that handles all the three semantic varieties presented earlier in the paper. Then, we analyze the complexity of the algorithm and prove its order-independence.

7.1 Outline of the Algorithm

The algorithm has two main building blocks. The first building block decides on which groups to join for a given input tuple. The second building block handles the various overlap semantics for SGB.

Let G_s be the set of existing groups constructed so far by the Algorithm. When a new tuple, say t_i , is being processed, we find the set of groups, say $G_m \subseteq G_s$, that t_i can join. Notice that G_s is initially empty. In this case, the first tuple to be processed will form a new group. Based on the various SGB-All semantics, Tuple t_i can join Group $g \in G_m$ iff $\forall t_j \in g$, the distance between t_i and t_j is smaller

than the threshold ϵ . To identify which groups to join, the first building block, $GQ(t_i, \epsilon, \delta)$, performs the above test and returns all the groups $G_m \subseteq G_s$ that t_i will join.

The straightforward way to evaluate $GQ(t_i, \epsilon, \delta)$ is to perform distance comparisons between t_i and each of the processed tuples that are members of the existing groups in G_s found thus far. Refer to Figure 6(a) for illustration, where L_∞ is assumed to be the underlying distance metric. In the figure, the following six tuples $t_1 \dots t_6$ have already been processed, and two groups g_1 and g_2 have already been formed. When it is time to process Tuple t_7 , this involves performing distance comparisons between t_7 and each of the tuples (t_1, t_2, t_3) that form Group g_1 , and then performing distance comparisons between t_7 and each of the tuples (t_4, t_5, t_6) that form g_2 . $GQ(t_i, \epsilon, \delta)$ performs this operation in a more efficient way as described later in this section.

The second building block handles partial group overlaps. Instead of joining existing groups, the input tuple t_i may have partial overlaps with individual members of existing groups (not entire groups). In this case, t_i can form new cliques with these tuples. We start by excluding all the groups that t_i has already joined after executing the first building block, i.e., excluding the output of $GQ(t_i, \epsilon, \delta)$. Thus, for all the remaining groups, i.e., $\hat{G} \in G_s$ and $\hat{G} \notin GQ(t_i, \epsilon, \delta)$, the second building block, $OQ(t_i, \epsilon, \delta)$, retrieves tuples from within $\hat{G}$ and decides if new cliques needs to be formed. These are the tuples that are enclosed within ϵ from Tuple t_i . Refer to Figure 6(a) and assume an L_∞ distance function. For tuple t_7 , there are no tuples that are within ϵ from Tuple t_7 (the red square in the figure).

Algorithm 1 gives the pseudo-code of the SGB-All operator using the straightforward all-pairs comparisons scheme described above. Line 1 iterates over all tuples, and for each tuple, searches all the existing groups in Set G_s , Function *GroupQuery*() (Line 2) checks whether the new tuple t_i can join one of the existing groups, say g_m , and it takes k distance comparisons to decide if t_i is within ϵ from each member tuple of g_m , where k is expected number of tuples in g_m . If one of these distances, say between t_i and t_j is bigger than ϵ , t_i fails to join Group g_m and searches the next group. Next, Function *OverlapQuery* determines the groups with partial overlap based on the all-pairs distance comparison (Line 3). Later, the post-processing step handles these overlap tuples among the various groups that they belong to (Line 4-12). More detail about this step is given below. Given the two *for-loop* iterations of *GroupQuery* and *OverlapQuery*, the total complexity of this straightforward approach is bound by $O(n^2)$. We need to reduce the computation costs of both the group join query $GQ(t_i, \epsilon, \delta)$ and the overlap query $OQ(t_i, \epsilon, \delta)$.

7.2 Identifying Which Groups To Join

For an input tuple, say t_i , and the groups identified so far, Procedure $GQ(t_i, \epsilon, \delta)$ identifies all the groups that t_i can join, i.e., when t_i forms a clique with all member tuples of these groups. Because this procedure is costly, the target is to reduce the cost of $GQ(t_i, \epsilon, \delta)$. The main idea is to construct a border around individual groups so that for each group, say g_m , we can test whether the new tuple t_i forms a clique with member tuples of g_m by only checking t_i against the border of g_m . This helps avoid the costly checking of the distance between t_i and each tuple inside g_m . The shape of the border of a group depends on the underlying distance

Algorithm 1: Skeleton Procedure for SGB-All

Input: Data Tuples in Relation T , Similarity threshold ϵ , distance function δ , overlap option OL

Output: Set of groups G_s

```

1 for each data element  $t_i$  in  $T$  do
2    $GQ(t_i, \epsilon, \delta) \leftarrow \text{GroupQuery}(t_i, G_s, \epsilon, \delta)$ 
3    $OQ(t_i, \epsilon, \delta) \leftarrow \text{OverlapQuery}(t_i, G_s, \epsilon, \delta)$ 
4   if  $OL$  is Duplicate then
5     find all groups,  $G_{new}$  from  $G_s$  that  $t_i$  forms a
      clique with
6     duplicate  $t_i$  into each of these groups
7   end
8   else if  $OL$  is Eliminate then
9     remove the tuples that overlap multiple groups
      from the tuples in the groups in  $G_s$ 
10  end
11  else if  $OL$  is Form-New then
12    find all the tuples that are within  $\epsilon$  from  $t_i$ 
13    save these overlap tuples for next round's
      processing
14  end
15  if  $GQ(t_i, \epsilon, \delta)$  is empty and  $OQ(t_i, \epsilon, \delta)$  is empty
    then
16    Form a new group  $g_{new}$  and insert  $g_{new}$  into  $G_s$ 
17  end
18 end

```

metric. For the L_2 distance metric, we propose to use an ϵ -convex hull border around each group, while for the L_∞ distance metric, we propose to use an ϵ -rectangular border as explained below.

Group borders for the L_2 distance metric. Let g_m be a group that contains multiple points that are all within a Distance ϵ from each other, i.e., that form a clique. For the L_2 distance metric, the group border for Group g_m is a convex hull that encompasses all the points in the group. Observe that the diameter d of the convex hull, i.e., the largest distance between any two points on the convex hull, is less than ϵ . To decide if Tuple t_i is a member of g_m , i.e., is within Distance ϵ from all tuples contained in g_m , it is enough to check if t_i is inside g_m 's enclosing convex hull.

Thus, to obtain $GQ(t_i, \epsilon, L_2)$, we iterate over all groups, and return all the groups g such that t_i is inside the ϵ -convex-hull of g . as stated in Lemma 3 below.

Lemma 3. Let g_m be a group where all of g_m 's points are within ϵ from each other. When we construct the convex-hull for the points in g_m (that we term the ϵ -convex-hull for g_m), then if a new tuple t_i is inside this ϵ -convex-hull, then g_m is contained in the $GQ(t_i, \epsilon, L_2)$.

PROOF. The SGB-All semantics guarantees that $t_i \in g_m$ iff $\forall t_j \in g_m, j \neq i, \delta(t_i, t_j) \leq \epsilon$. Let the diameter, say d , of the convex hull be the maximum distance between any two points in the convex hull. Therefore, d should also be less than ϵ . Consequently, if a new tuple t_i is inside the convex hull of g_m , the distance from Tuple t_i to any other tuple $t_j \in g_m$ is smaller than ϵ . Otherwise, this will contradict the definition of the convex hull. Therefore, t_i should also belong to g_m . Hence, g_m is in $GQ(t_i, \epsilon, L_2)$. $\square$




Figure 6: Illustration of SGB-All, tuples are processed in order of their subscript, i.e., from t_1 to t_{12} .




Figure 7: Illustration of the various group bounds for SGB-All. (a) A convex polygon in the case of the L_2 distance metric, and (b) A rectangle in the case of the L_∞ distance metric.

For example, consider the two triangles in Figure 6(a) that form the convex hulls for Groups g_1 and g_2 . Tuple t_8 is located inside the convex hull for Group g_2 and is outside the convex hull for Group g_1 . Thus, $GQ(t_8, \epsilon, L_2) = \{g_2\}$. However, if a tuple is outside the convex hull, it can still form a clique with members of a group, and hence can still join the group. For example, in Figure 6(a), Tuple t_7 is outside the convex hull for Group g_1 . However, t_7 forms a clique with all points that compose Group g_1 , and hence should join g_1 , i.e., $GQ(t_7, \epsilon, L_2) = \{g_1\}$. Lemma 4 handles this situation.

Lemma 4. Let g_m be a group whose elements are within Distance ϵ from each other. Let t_i be a tuple outside the convex hull of g_m such that the distance from t_i to the farthest point in the convex hull is less than or equal to ϵ . Then, g_m is contained in $GQ(t_i, \epsilon, L_2)$.

PROOF. Assume that Group g_m has k points and that a tuple, say $t_j \in g_m$, is the point with farthest distance from Tuple t_i among all the points of g_m . Tuple t_j has to be one of the corner tuples of the convex hull of g_m and cannot be an internal tuple in g_m . This can be shown by contradiction. Suppose that t_j is an internal point of g_m and the distance between t_j and t_i is the farthest compared to all the other tuples of g_m . Then, we can extend the line from Tuple t_i to Tuple t_j , and this line would intersect one

of the border lines of the convex hull, e.g., a line connecting between two points, say t_a and t_b , on the border of the convex hull of g_m . Refer to Figure 7a for illustration. Let the intersection point be t'_j . Naturally, $\delta(t_i, t'_j) > \delta(t_i, t_j)$. In addition, based on simple triangular properties, one of the following enequalities has to be true: $\delta(t_i, t_a) > \delta(t_i, t'_j)$ or $\delta(t_i, t_b) > \delta(t_i, t'_j)$. As a result, $\delta(t_i, t_j)$ is not the farthest distance and this contradicts the assumption. Therefore, if the distance from Tuple t_i to the farthest point in Group G_m (which has to be one of the points in the convex hull for g_m) is bigger than ϵ , then t_i cannot join in Group g_m . $\square$

In Figure 6(a), Tuple t_1 has the farthest distance to t_7 from among all the tuples in Group g_1 , where this distance is smaller than ϵ . Then, $GQ(t_7, \epsilon, L_2) = (g_1)$. More generally, a Group, say g_m , is contained in $GQ(t_i, \epsilon, L_2)$ if t_i is inside the ϵ -convex-hull bound of g_m , or if the longest distance from t_i to the points in the convex hull of g_m is not larger than ϵ . Notice that the ϵ -convex-hull bound of Group g_m needs to be updated each time a new tuple joins the group. The worst case takes place when all the points on the convex hull of g_m are on the circumference of a circle with diameter ϵ . For each Group, say g_m , that has k tuples, the expected average number of convex points is $\log(k)$ [?]. Thus, with Lemmas 3 and 4, we can limit the distance comparisons inside any one group. Thus, the average case of running time to judge a new tuple inside one convex hull is $\log(\log(k))$.

Group bound for the L_∞ distance: In the case of the L_∞ distance metric, a rectangle replaces the ϵ -convex hull of a group. A tuple t_i 's ϵ -region is a square with Length $2*\epsilon$ centered at t_i . A tuple, say t_j , is within an L_∞ Distance ϵ from t_i iff t_j is inside t_i 's ϵ -region. When t_j joins the group containing t_i , we shrink the group's ϵ -region to maintain the following invariant: A tuple, say t , is within an L_∞ Distance ϵ from all members of a group, say g , iff t is inside the group's ϵ -region. Refer to Figure 7b for illustration. Initially, when t_1 is inserted, a square centered at t_1 with side 2ϵ forms the ϵ -region for t_1 , i.e., any new tuple that overlaps this region will be with ϵ from t_1 in the L_∞ distance metric. When Tuple t_2 is processed and is found to be within this ϵ -region, the group is now updated to contain t_1 and t_2 and the ϵ -region is shrunk to be the intersection of the ϵ -regions for both of t_1 and t_2 , which is Rectangle R2 in the figure. When Tuple t_3 is processed and is found to be inside R_2 , i.e., t_3 is within ϵ from all members of the group corresponding to R_2 , i.e., the group containing Tuples t_1 and t_2 . Once t_3 joins the group, the ϵ -region for the group is shrunk to be equal to the intersection of R_2 and the ϵ -region for t_3 . Now, the ϵ -region for the group $\{t_1, t_2, t_3\}$ becomes Rectangle R_3 . The following lemma 5 summarizes the approach above to avoid distance computations to each member of a group while deciding on which groups to join i.e., when evaluating $GQ(t_i, \epsilon, L_\infty)$.

Lemma 5. The ϵ -rectangle bound of a group, say g_m , is one rectangle that is the intersection of all the ϵ -regions of all the tuples $t_j \in g_m$. If a new tuple, say t_i , is inside g_m 's ϵ -rectangle, then $\forall t_j \in g_m, \delta(t_i, t_j) \leq \epsilon$, and group g_m is contained in $GQ(t_i, \epsilon, L_\infty)$.

Refer to Figure 6(a) for further illustration. In the figure, it is assumed that the tuples are processed according to their subscript index, i.e., from t_1 to t_{12} in this order. By the time Tuple t_3 is processed, the ϵ -regions for Tuples t_1, t_2 , and

t_3 intersect to form the surrounding rectangle with a dotted line boundary in the lower-left of the figure that corresponds to the group bound for g_1 . Similarly, by the time Tuple t_6 is processed, the ϵ -regions for Tuples t_4, t_5 , and t_6 intersect to form the surrounding rectangle with a dotted line boundary that corresponds to the group bound for g_2 . When Tuple t_9 is processed, it is found to be outside of the existing two group bounds for g_1 and g_2 . Hence, $GQ(t_9, \epsilon, L_\infty)$ is empty and t_9 forms a new group by itself. This way, we only check whether t_i is inside the existing group bounds, which is performed in constant time per group regardless of the number of tuples in each group.

Group bound by ϵ -rectangle and ϵ -convex hull together For the L_2 distance metric, the ϵ -rectangle bound also can be applied to filter out the unnecessary distance computation with respect to the ϵ -convex hull of group. For example, i.e., Figure 6 (a), two triangles in this example are the convex hull group bound for Group G_1 and G_2 , which are enclosed by the ϵ -rectangle of each group, thus, we can find t_9 can not join in group G_1 and G_2 for L_2 distance metric early, because t_9 is outside of the groups' ϵ -rectangle. This is illustrated in the developed Lemma 6.

Lemma 6. Given a group G_m , G_m is contained in the $GQ(t_i, \epsilon, L_2)$ by Lemma 3 or Lemma 4, then tuple t_i is certain enclose by the G_m 's ϵ -rectangle bound. On the contrary, one tuple stay inside Group G_m 's ϵ -rectangle bound, yet, G_m might not be contained in $GQ(t_i, \epsilon, L_2)$.

PROOF. This proof is based on the distance metric properties, that is, $\delta(t_i, t_j)$ by the L_2 distance metric $\geq \delta(t_i, t_j)$ by L_∞ distance metric because of triangle properties. Based on this distance metric properties, we omitted the rest of proof because this prove by mathematical induction is straightforward. $\square$

Index of group bound is used to avoid searching through all exist group sets G_s . Multi-dimensional indexing like R-tree index over exist group sets G_s 's ϵ -rectangle bound can enable group join query much quickly. Given a tuple t_i with ϵ -region, the range query to go through index to find groups, which are contained by the ϵ -region of tuple t_i . Take Figure 6 (a) as an example, suppose one index like R-tree for the exist groups G_1, G_2 's ϵ -rectangle bound, G_1 and G_2 are not contained in $GQ(t_9, \epsilon, L_2)$ by searching through from index root to leaf node.

7.3 Overlap Query

For overlap tuples among groups, there are three types of cases to be considered.

- $OQ(t_i, \epsilon, \delta)$ is empty, and $GQ(t_i, \epsilon, \delta)$ is not empty and queried group sets size is bigger than one, then t_i is a overlap tuple. Consider the example in Figure6(b), $GQ(t_{11}, \epsilon, L_\infty) = (G_1, G_2)$, and tuple t_{11} is enclosed by the ϵ -rectangle bound of Group G_1 and G_2 . Thus, t_{11} is the overlap tuple for Group G_1 and G_2 .
- $GQ(t_i, \epsilon, \delta)$ is empty, $OQ(t_i, \epsilon, \delta)$ is not empty, tuples of $OQ(t_i, \epsilon, \delta)$ are overlap sets. For example, tuple t_9 in Figure6(b), $GQ(t_9, \epsilon, L_\infty)$ is empty, but tuples (t_5, t_8) are contained in the ϵ -region of t_9 . Thus, after building new group G_3 for tuple t_9 , tuples (t_5, t_8) are overlap sets between Group G_2 and G_3 .

- $GQ(t_i, \epsilon, \delta)$ and $OQ(t_i, \epsilon, \delta)$ is not empty, tuples of $OQ(t_i, \epsilon, \delta)$ and t_i are overlap sets. Revisit Figure6(b) as an example, in term of tuple t_{10} , group join query $GQ(t_{10}, \epsilon, L_\infty) = G_1$, and overlap query $OQ(t_{10}, \epsilon, L_\infty) = t_4$, thus, (t_{10}, t_4) are overlap sets for Group G_1 and G_2 .

Naively, overlap query $OQ(t_i, \epsilon, \delta)$ approach goes through all exist group sets G_s , then retrieval overlap tuples in t_i 's ϵ -region. To avoid searching all the exist groups, we try to find overlap group candidates by the developed group bound in Lemma 5. Take Figure6(b) as an example, the ϵ -region of t_9 is denoted as the red square, the region intersects with Group G_2 's ϵ -rectangle bound, while it does not have intersection with G_1 's. Thus, we can assure that overlap sets between tuple t_9 and Group G_1 is empty, and overlap between tuple t_9 and Group G_2 is not empty. Hence, ϵ -region and group ϵ -rectangle bound is a optimal way to filter out some redundant computation checking, as stated in Lemma 7 below.

Lemma 7. Given a group G_m , G_m is not in $GQ(t_i, \epsilon, \delta)$. G_m has overlap tuple t_i if ϵ -rectangle bound of Group G_m intersects with ϵ -region of tuple t_i .

Proof for the Lemma 7 is straightforward base on the definition of ϵ -region and the group rectangle bound of Lemma 5, we omit the details. As a result, the built multi-dimensional index over the group rectangle bound enable us to find overlap groups candidates efficiently without going through all the exist group. In addition, different from the $GQ(t_i, \epsilon, \delta)$, overlap query need to get overlap tuples from overlap tuples, which are belong to the overlap group candidates. The straight approach would go through all tuples of group G_m , and the optimal way is building multi-dimensional index e.g., Quadtree [16] for tuples $t_j \in G_m$ to support ϵ -region range query of tuple t_i .

7.4 Handle overlap

Follow the SGB-All semantic, there are three options to handle the overlap tuples among groups. For overlap Eliminate, the overlap tuples are removed from output sets. For New-Group option, the overlap tuples are materiel and processed by the next round of SGB-All operation until the overlap tuple sets are empty. Look at Figure6(b) as example, when processing tuple t_9 , group join query $GQ(t_9, \epsilon, L_\infty)$ is empty, and overlap query $OQ(t_9, \epsilon, L_\infty) = (t_3, t_8)$. Thus, (t_3, t_8) are marked as removable from Group G_2 , and are processed again in the next round.

For overlap-Duplicate option, if overlap tuples are from different exist groups, we need to check the maximal of new built group. Take the Figure6(b) as example, after finish processing tuple t_1 to t_{11} based on SGB-All overlap-Duplicate semantic, Group G_1 contain tuples $(t_1, t_2, t_3, t_7, t_{10}, t_{11})$, Group $G_2 = (t_4, t_5, t_6, t_8, t_{11})$, Group $G_3 = (t_5, t_8, t_9)$. For the new coming tuple t_{12} , group join query $GQ(t_{12}, \epsilon, L_\infty)$ is empty, and overlap query $OQ(t_{12}, \epsilon, L_\infty)$ contain tuples (t_7, t_{10}, t_{11}) from G_1 , and (t_{11}) from G_2 . From the SGB-All semantic, tuple $(t_7, t_{10}, t_{11}, t_{12})$ can form a new group G_4 , while tuples (t_{11}, t_{12}) can form other new group G_5 . However, group candidate G_5 is contained by group candidate G_4 , therefore, only one group G_4 is built. Substring matching is an effective way for maximal groups checking, because tuple sets of one clique

can be represented as a order string, then, one group is contained by others iff its mapped string is a substring of others'. Take the group candidate G_4 and G_5 as example, Group candidate G_4 is mapped to string $\{7, 10, 11, 12\}$, and G_5 is mapped to string $\{11, 12\}$. String $\{11, 12\}$ is contained by string $\{7, 10, 11, 12\}$, thus Group candidate G_5 is not maximal.

7.5 SGB-All Query Cost Model

In this section, we develop cost models for SGB-All search to estimate the running time of each overlap option. We at first give the running time cost for group join query $GQ(t_i, \epsilon, \delta)$ and overlap query $OQ(t_i, \epsilon, \delta)$, then analysis the cost for different overlap option. Although we mainly discuss the 2D space, the discussion can be extended to higher dimension.

In term of group join query $GQ(t_i, \epsilon)$, for a Group G_m with k points, the expected size of ϵ -convex-hull is $h = \log(k)$, and judge tuple t_i inside this convex hull can be done in $O(\log(h))$ time [17]. In addition, as Lemma 4, we need to check distance from t_i to farthest tuple of ϵ -convex-hull whether is smaller than ϵ , and this can be done via $\log(h)$ time. As a result, we can reduce naive all pairs distance computation from k to $O(\log(\log(k)))$. Furthermore, multi-dimension index like R-tree [18] can be used to index group's ϵ -rectangle, and this can improve groups searching iteration time from number of exist groups, say $|G_s|$, to $O(\log(|G_s|))$. As a result, the running time complexity of the $GQ(t_i, \epsilon, \delta)$ can be enhanced from $O(n^2)$ to $O(n * \log(|G_s|) * \log(\log(k)))$.

In term of overlap query $OQ(t_i, \epsilon, \delta)$, based on the index over Group G_m 's ϵ rectangle, we can find overlap group candidates via $\log(|G_s|)$ time following Lemma 7. In addition, retrieval overlap tuples from Group overlap candidate G_m can be done in $O(\log(k))$ based on the multi-dimensional index for tuples of overlap group candidate. Finally, suppose overlap group candidates size is $\log(|G_s|)$ in average, the total cost for querying the overlap tuples is $O(n * \log(|G_s|) + n * \log(|G_s|) * \log(k))$.

Overall, sum of group join query and overlap query cost is $O(n * \log(|G_s|) * \log(k))$. We can observe that the running time of SGB-All query is depend on the output number of groups $|G_s|$ and number of tuples of one Group, say k . Furthermore, both two factors are depend on input parameter ϵ and data overlap option. We analysis the upper bound of output groups number $|G_s|$ for different overlap option below.

Lemma 8. Given output group sets G under SGB-All+Eliminate and SGB-All-New-Group option, any two groups G_m, G'_m of G do not share any tuples, and the upper bound of output group sets size $|G_s|$ is $O(n)$.

PROOF. This can be proved by contradiction. Assume that t_i was shared by two groups G_m and G'_m , then the $t_i \in Osets$ then $Osets = G_m \cap G'_m$ and $Osets$ is not empty. This contradicts the semantic of SGB-All+Eliminate and SGB-All+New-Group, where the overlap $Osets$ is always empty. Therefore, each tuple only belong to one group. As a result, the number of groups $|G_s|$ has an upper-bound $O(n)$. $\square$

SGB-All+Eliminate Following lemma 8, the running time complexity for SGB-All+Eliminate via the group bound and multi-dimensional index approach is $O(n * \log(n) * \log(k))$ since $|G_s| \leq n$.

SGB-All+New-Group overlap tuples are recursively processed until the overlap sets are empty, then the running time complexity of New-Group is depend on the recursive depth. Let the recursive processing depth be d , and for each recursively process, number of tuples be n_i , output of group size be $|G_{si}|$ and average number of tuples of group be k_i , the total running time complexity is $O(d * n * \log(n) * \log(k))$, because $\sum_{i=1}^d O(n_i * \log(|G_{si}|) * \log(k_i)) < \sum_{i=1}^d O(n * \log(|G_s|) * \log(k)) < O(d * n * \log(n) * \log(k))$.

SGB-All+Duplicate is exponential delay Following the semantics of SGB-All+Duplicate, this operator finds the groups G_s that are maximal clique sets. For $G_m \in G_s$, assume that the average size of a group is $ave|G_m| = k$. Consider the k tuple permutations problem for different groups, the number of groups would be $\Omega(k^2 * \binom{n}{k})$. As ϵ increases, then each group cover more tuples, group sizes $|G|$ can be large, e.g., $k = n/2$. Thus, even if we build the group bound and index for each group, the complexity is inflect by the number of output groups, and this brings the processing delay to be super-polynomial. For example, variants of Moon and Mose algorithm [12] can be shown to have worst-case running time $O(3^{n/3})$. Overall, for the duplicate option, the SGB-All query time is bound by the number of groups, and this delay can be exponential.

8. CORRECTNESS OF SGB OPERATORS

In this section, we prove that SGB-All are order-independent operators for the one- (1D) and two-dimensional (2D) spaces by the proposed algorithm. As we introduced before, SGB-All query can be viewed as cliques listing from undirected graph. Therefore, SGB-All operator is a order independent semantic if we build graph first and apply cliques listing algorithm. In other words, the output cliques sets are identical because the correspond graph structure is fixed beforehand. However, follow our previous discussion, we want to scan tuple in minimal time and output groups without building graph beforehand. Thus, we need to prove the proposed ϵ -group bound approach via Lemma 3,4 and 5 do not change outputs. The proofs build on results obtained from two classes of intersection graphs, namely the interval graph [19] for the 1D case and the rectangle graph (also referred to as the Boxicity graph [20]) for the 2D case.

8.1 Order Independent of Interval Graph

Definition 8. Interval graph (IG) is the intersection graph of a multiset of intervals on the real line.

It has one vertex for each interval in the set, and connects two vertexes by an edge *iff* their corresponding sets have nonempty intersection [19]. Figure 8a gives the corresponding interval set $I_1, I_2, \dots, I_6$ for the Earnings attribute in Figure 4. For instance, I_1 's center point is Tuple t_1 and its corresponding interval varies among $(t_1 - \epsilon, t_1 + \epsilon)$, where $\epsilon = 6$. The interval set's corresponding interval graph is given in Figure 8b.

Lemma 9. [19] A graph is an interval graph *iff* its corresponding clique vertex matrix exhibits the consecutive-ones property.

The clique matrix of an undirected graph is an incidence matrix having maximal cliques as rows and vertexes as




Figure 8: (a) Intervals for the tuples in Figure 5, (b) their corresponding interval graph, and (c) their corresponding center interval graph.

columns [21, 19]. Let M be the clique matrix for a graph, say G . $M[i,j]=1$ means that Vertex i is one of the vertexes in Clique j . Matrix M is said to exhibit the consecutive-ones property in a given column if the rows can be permuted in a way so that the ones can appear consecutively in that column. For example, in Figure 8(B), we can observe that the clique matrix exhibits the consecutive-ones property for the interval graph in the same figure. According to [19], an undirected graph G is an interval graph if and only if the clique matrix of G has the consecutive ones property for columns.

Lemma 10. Maximal clique sets in the interval graph are order-independent with respect to the order of the intervals.

PROOF. For an interval graph, its corresponding clique matrix, say M_k , differs according to the order of introducing the intervals. However, these different clique matrixes can always be reordered into one unique clique matrix as follows. First, the interval order cannot change the intersection relations among the intervals. So, the columns of all matrixes will always be the same. Secondly, the rows of the clique matrix can be reordered to exhibit the consecutive-ones property. Thus, the clique matrixes for different reshufflings of the order of the input intervals will always lead to the same identical matrix by linear matrix transformations. As a result, the maximal clique sets will be the same regardless of the order of processing of the intervals in the interval graph, and hence are order-independent. $\square$

8.2 SGB-All+Duplicate for the 1D Space

Each interval have a center point. When two intervals intersect, it does not necessarily mean that the distance between their corresponding tuples, which are in the center, is smaller than ϵ . As an alternative formation, consider the case when we connect vertexes in the interval graph *iff* an interval's center point is located inside another interval. This

graph is referred to as a center interval graph (*CIG*) as follows.

Definition 9. ϵ -Center interval graph (ϵ -*CIG*): let the interval diameter be $2 * \epsilon$ and the center point be a tuple, say t_i , the related center interval graph is called ϵ -*CIG* iff vertexes in the interval graph have edges while an interval's center point is located inside another's interval.

For example, Figure 8c gives the ϵ -*CIG* graph for the intervals in Figure 8a. Notice that it is always the case that the center interval graph is always a subgraph of the corresponding interval graph (refer to Figures 8b and 8c for illustration). Observe that two vertexes that are connected by an edge in the ϵ -*CIG* implies that distance between the corresponding two tuples is within ϵ .

Lemma 11. ϵ -*CIG* is built via ϵ -rectangle group bound in the one dimensional space, and SGB-All+Duplicate via ϵ -rectangle bound approach finds the maximal clique sets in ϵ -*CIG*.

PROOF. Recall that in the SGB-All operator, tuples belong to one group iff the similarity predicate $\xi_{s,\epsilon}(t_i, t_j)$ is true. This grouping process in the 1D space is similar to the way a ϵ -*CIG* graph is constructed by the ϵ -rectangle group bound, because ϵ -rectangle group bound stands the same distance criteria of interval graph. Notice the ϵ -rectangle group bound is an interval in one dimensional space. Meanwhile, each group $G_m \in G_s$ is an all- ϵ -Connected group, and the all- ϵ -Connected group is a maximal clique when mapping its tuples to the corresponding graph. So, the maximal clique sets of the ϵ -*CIG* are the SGB-All+Duplicate via ϵ -rectangle bound approach output groups G_s in the 1D space. $\square$

Lemma 12. SGB-All+Duplicate is an order-independent operator in the 1D space via ϵ -rectangle group bound.

PROOF. From Lemma 10, the maximal clique sets in the interval graph are order-independent. The ϵ -*CIG* is a subgraph of the corresponding interval graph, the order-independent property is still true for building the ϵ -*CIG* subgraph via group bound Lemma 11. This can be easily proven by contradiction (omitted here for brevity). Therefore, we can conclude that SGB-All+Duplicate is order-independent if applying the ϵ -bound in the 1D space based on Lemma 11 as SGB-All+Duplicate via ϵ -rectangle group bound approach finds the maximal clique sets in ϵ -*CIG*. $\square$

8.3 SGB-All+Duplicate for Higher Dimensional Spaces

We come to prove the SGB-All+Duplicate via group bound is still order-independent in higher dimensions. We use the two-dimensional case for illustration. First, we introduce *RciG* to illustrate the L_∞ distance between two tuples, say t_i and t_j . As we introduced before, for one tuple t_i , its ϵ range is a square with length $2 * \epsilon$. This implies that if one tuple, say t_j , is located inside other tuple t_i 's ϵ -region R_i , the L_∞ distance between t_i and t_j is smaller than ϵ . For example, in Figure 9a, Tuple t_2 is inside t_1 's square R_1 , and the L_∞ distance between t_1 and t_2 is smaller than ϵ . Thus, each vertex v represents one square, and two vertexes have an edge between if only if their center points c are inside other's rectangle. Formally, we define *RciG* as follows.




Figure 9: (a) ϵ -Rectangles and (b) ϵ -*RciG* for parts of the data in Figure 4.

Definition 10. Rectangle center intersection Graph (*RciG*), *RciG* is a graph in which two vertexes, say v_i and v_j , are connected by an edge if only if their center points stay in each other's corresponding rectangle. Specifically, if the rectangle's center point is t_i and the length of the rectangle is $2 * \epsilon$, this rectangle is referred to as an ϵ -square for tuple t_i . The ϵ -rectangle center intersection graph is termed ϵ -*RciG*.

Figure 9a gives an example of ϵ -rectangle intersection for parts of the data in Figure 4, and Figure 9b is the corresponding ϵ -*RciG*. The ϵ -rectangle intersection result is the group ϵ -rectangle bound for the processed tuples. Based on the ϵ -rectangle, the maximal cliques in the ϵ -*RciG* graph are the all- ϵ -Connected groups produced as output by the SGB-All+Duplicate operator using the L_∞ distance metric via group bound.

To prove that ϵ -*RciG* shares relevant properties with ϵ -*CiG*, we can project the 2D rectangles in ϵ -*RciG* into the horizontal and vertical dimensions separately, then the projections are the corresponding intervals in the two corresponding ϵ -*CiGs*. For example, Rectangle R_1 in Figure 9 with center point $t_1(11, 1)$, and its rectangle length is $2 * \epsilon = 12$. Then, the projection of this rectangle in the horizontal dimension is $I1_x(11 - 6, 11 + 6)$ and in the vertical line is $I1_y(1 - 6, 1 + 6)$.

Lemma 13. Two rectangles have intersection iff both of their projection intervals in the real lines intersect, and ϵ -*RciG* is the intersection sets of ϵ -*CiG* in one dimension.

Naturally, the ϵ -*RciG* is the intersection sets of ϵ -*CiG*. From Lemma 10, the maximal cliques sets in the interval graph via group bound are order-independent. Thus, we use this conclusion to prove that the maximal cliques in the ϵ -*RciG* are also order-independent by the following lemma.

Lemma 14. The intersection between two order-independent sets are also order-independent.

PROOF. We can prove this Lemma by contradiction. Suppose two input order sets D_1 and D_2 , and their order-independent output sets are G_{s1} and G_{s2} , respectively. Assume that the intersection $x = (G_{s1} \cap G_{s2}) \neq null$, and suppose that x is order-dependent in parts of D_1 and D_2 .

Let this part of the data in D_1 and D_2 be d'_1 and d'_2 , respectively. Because x is dependent on the order of d'_1 and d'_2 , if we reorder d'_1 and d'_2 , the output x will change. When we have a different x , the order-independent outputs G_{s1} and G_{s2} would also be changed because x is always the intersection of G_{s1} and G_{s2} . This contradicts the assumption that G_{s1} and G_{s2} are order-independent on D_1 and D_2 . The reason is that from the order-independence definition, when we reorder part of the data in D_1 and D_2 , G_{s1} and G_{s2} still do not change. Thus, we prove that the intersection of two order-independent sets are also order-independent. $\square$

Lemma 15. SGB-All+Duplicate operation via group ϵ -rectangle bound is an order-independent operator for the L_∞ distance in higher dimension.

PROOF. From Lemma 13, ϵ -RciG is the intersection of the two interval graphs, and the correspond maximal cliques in the interval graph built from group ϵ -rectangle bound are order-independent. Thus, we can conclude that maximal cliques are order-independent in the 2D space according to the L_∞ distance because the intersection of two order-independent sets are still order-independent according to Lemma 14. As a result, SGB-All+Duplicate is an order-independent operator via ϵ -group bound. More importantly, this proof can be extended to higher dimensions because we can project higher dimensional boxes to multiple lower-dimensional boxes, and Lemma 13 is always true for set intersection. $\square$

Next, we prove that SGB-All+Duplicate is order-independent according to the L_2 distance metric by the ϵ -convex hull group bound. Tuple t_i can be represented by a circle with Radius ϵ , termed an ϵ -circle. Similar to the ϵ -rectangle, any tuple, say t_j , that is inside t_i 's ϵ -circle is within distance less than ϵ from t_i . Similar to the process for building the ϵ -RciG graph, we can build the ϵ -circle intersection graph via the Lemma 3 and 4, because ϵ -convex hull group bound meets the distance criteria of building the ϵ -circle intersection graph.

Lemma 16. The SGB-All+Duplicate operator via ϵ -convex hull group bound is order-independent for the L_2 distance metric in higher dimensional spaces.

PROOF. For each tuple, say t_i , the ϵ -circle inscribes the ϵ -rectangle closely. Thus, if one tuple, say t_j , is located inside t_i 's enclosing rectangle, then t_j can still be outside of t_i 's circle. This means that the L_2 distance between t_i and t_j can be larger than ϵ . Thus, the ϵ -RciG graph is the superset of the ϵ -circle intersection graph. Because the maximal cliques in ϵ -RciG, which are output from the SGB-All duplicate via ϵ -rectangle group bound, are order-independent, then their subset is also order-independent. This can be proved by contradiction. So, SGB-All+Duplicate via ϵ -convex hull bound is still order-independent for L_2 distance metric. $\square$

Conclusion 1. Operator SGB-All+Duplicate is order-independent via group bound approach for the 1D and higher dimensions

8.4 Order-independence of SGB-All+New-Group and SGB-All+Eliminate

In the previous section, we have demonstrated that SGB-All+Duplicate is order-independent. In this section, we

prove that the other two overlap options, namely On Overlap Eliminate and On Overlap New-Group are also order-independent.

PROOF. For the output groups sets from the SGB-All+Duplicate operation, we can mark the overlap tuples $OSet$ by an additional linear-time scan over G_s . Then, we can remove all the marked overlap tuples in $OSet$ from G_s and put $OSet$ into a temporal tuple set D_{tmp} . We call this process is a one-time-iteration for SGB-All+New-Group. For tuples in D_{tmp} , we repeat the one-time-iteration recursively until D_{tmp} is empty. This is one possible procedure for the SGB-All+New-Group operator. Notice that the algorithm of SGB-All+New-Group does not need to depend on SGB-All+Duplicate. For the one-time-iteration, we prefer to use Quadtree [?] for its simplicity. SGB-All+New-Group has identical output group sets on any order of D_{tmp} because of Conclusion 1. Thus, SGB-All-New-Group is order-independent. $\square$

Similarly, we can prove that SGB-All+Eliminate is also order-independent.

PROOF. We remove the overlapping tuples in $OSet$ from the output group sets G_s of SGB-All+Duplicate. If SGB-All+Eliminate is order-dependent, it means that the $OSet$ changes each time. This contradicts that SGB-All+Duplicate is order-independent because the overlap in the SGB-All+Duplicate not change. $\square$

Finally, we conclude that

Conclusion 2. SGB-All+New-Group and SGB-All+Eliminate via group bound are order-independent.

9. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we study the problem of order-independent similarity group by. This problem is motivated by the fact that traditional similarity group by operators do not necessarily produce identical results when the order of processing the input tables are altered. We define the class of order-independent similarity group by operators (SGB), then introduce the SGB-All semantics to find the similar groups in the input sets. We provide the computational complexity costs of SGB-All, and demonstrate that useful variants of them can be implemented efficiently inside a database management system. Finally, using the notion of interval graphs, we prove that our newly developed SGB are order-independent by the efficient group bound approach. There are many interesting future directions that we plan to explore. Different from SGB-All, we can propose SGB-Any semantic, which forms groups such that a data item, say O , belongs to a group, say G , if and only if O is within a user-defined threshold from at least one other data item in G . It will be interesting and useful to embed the operators developed in this paper inside a relational database engine. In fact, we have already started developing these SGB operators inside PostgreSQL.

10. REFERENCES

- [1] M. Hall, E. Frank, G. Holmes, B. Pfahringer, P. Reutemann, and I. H. Witten, "The weka data mining software: an update," *SIGKDD Explor. Newsl.*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 10–18, 2009.

- [2] Y. N. Silva, W. G. Aref, and M. H. Ali, "Similarity group-by," in *Data Engineering, 2009. ICDE'09. IEEE 25th International Conference on*. IEEE, 2009, pp. 904–915.
- [3] Y. N. Silva, W. G. Aref, P.-Å. Larson, S. Pearson, and M. H. Ali, "Similarity queries: their conceptual evaluation, transformations, and processing," *VLDB J.*, vol. 22, no. 3, pp. 395–420, 2013.
- [4] P. Berkhin, "A survey of clustering data mining techniques," in *Grouping multidimensional data*. Springer, 2006, pp. 25–71.
- [5] J. Han, M. Kamber, and J. Pei, *Data mining: concepts and techniques*. Morgan kaufmann, 2006.
- [6] T. Kanungo, D. M. Mount, N. S. Netanyahu, C. D. Piatko, R. Silverman, and A. Y. Wu, "An efficient k-means clustering algorithm: Analysis and implementation," *Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 24, no. 7, pp. 881–892, 2002.
- [7] T. Zhang, R. Ramakrishnan, and M. Livny, "Birch: an efficient data clustering method for very large databases," in *ACM SIGMOD Record*, vol. 25, no. 2. ACM, 1996, pp. 103–114.
- [8] M. Ester, H.-P. Kriegel, J. Sander, and X. Xu, "A density-based algorithm for discovering clusters in large spatial databases with noise," in *KDD*, vol. 96, 1996, pp. 226–231.
- [9] M. R. Anderberg, "Cluster analysis for applications," DTIC Document, Tech. Rep., 1973.
- [10] T. A. McKee and F. R. McMorris, *Topics in intersection graph theory*. Siam, 1999, vol. 2.
- [11] R. M. Karp, "Reducibility Among Combinatorial Problems," in *Complexity of Computer Computations*, R. E. Miller and J. W. Thatcher, Eds. Plenum Press, 1972, pp. 85–103.
- [12] I. M. Bomze, M. Budinich, P. M. Pardalos, and M. Pelillo, "The maximum clique problem," in *Handbook of Combinatorial Optimization*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1999, pp. 1–74.
- [13] X. Hu, Y. Tao, and C.-W. Chung, "Massive graph triangulation," in *Proceedings of the 2013 ACM SIGMOD International Conference on Management of Data*, ser. SIGMOD '13. New York, NY, USA: ACM, 2013, pp. 325–336. [Online]. Available: <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/2463676.2463704>
- [14] J. Kruskal, "Multidimensional scaling by optimizing goodness of fit to a nonmetric hypothesis," *Psychometrika*, vol. 29, no. 1, pp. 1–27, 1964. [Online]. Available: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF02289565>
- [15] V. Boginski, S. Butenko, and P. M. Pardalos, "On structural properties of the market graph," 2003.
- [16] R. Finkel and J. Bentley, "Quad trees a data structure for retrieval on composite keys," vol. 4, no. 1. Springer-Verlag, 1974, pp. 1–9. [Online]. Available: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF00288933>
- [17] M. J. Atallah, "Computing the convex hull of line intersections," *J. Algorithms*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 285–288, 1986.
- [18] A. Guttman, "R-trees: A dynamic index structure for spatial searching," in *international conference on management of data*. ACM, 1984, pp. 47–57.
- [19] D. R. Fulkerson and O. A. Gross, "Incidence Matrices and Interval Graphs," *Pacific J. Math.*, vol. 15, pp. 835–855, 1965.
- [20] L. S. Chandran and N. Sivadasan, "Boxicity and treewidth," *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, vol. 97, no. 5, pp. 733 – 744, 2007. [Online]. Available: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0095895607000111>
- [21] T. A. McKee and F. R. McMorris, *Topics in Intersection Graph Theory, Discrete Mathematics and Applications*. SIAM, 1999. [Online]. Available: <http://epubs.siam.org/doi/book/10.1137/1.9780898719802>